श्री लालू प्रसाद: सभापति जी, मैं दो दिन से देख रहा हूं। मैं बराबर हाथ उठाता हूं, हाथ उठाते-उठाते हाथ में तकलीफ हो गई है। हम लोगों को भी तो कुछ टाइम दीजिए।

श्री सभापति: मैं आपको टाइम दूंगा, किसने मना किया है?

श्री लालू प्रसाद: कहां दे रहे हैं सर? अगर आप मुझे रोक देंगे तो मैं क्या करूंगा?

श्री सभापति: यह तो अच्छी बात है कि आप हमारा कहना मानते हैं।

श्री लालू प्रसाद: आगे से ख्याल रखिए।

श्री सभापति: ठीक है, आगे से मैं ख्याल रखूंगा।

Setting up of Broadcasting Regulatory Authority of India

*104. SHRIMATI BIMBA RAIKAR:††
SHRI NANA DESHMUKH:

Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to set up a Broadcasting Regulatory Authority of India on the lines of TRAI;

(b) if so, whether Government have examined functioning of such other regulatory bodies like Federal Communications Commission of US and office of the Communications of UK before taking a view in this regard; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD): (a) to (c) There is a felt need for an institutional mechanism for regulation of some aspects of broadcasting. Examination of the working of similar institutions/authorities in selected countries and a wider consultation with stake holders would be necessary for deciding on the appropriate framework.

SHRIMATI BIMBA RAIKAR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to ask the Minister, when we are not in a position to have control on telecom sector through TRAI, why the Government wants to impose such an

††The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shrimati Bimba Raikar.

authority on broadcasting sector. Is it because countries like UK and USA have regulatory bodies? Why should we follow this system, which is not practicable in India?

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, there is no question of following any particular system. The whole concept of a regulator, whether in America or England, is a subject of our study. But, I would like to inform the hon. Member that while I was replying to a previous query, a lot of Members emphasized on the need for a regulator. Yes, the Government is equally appreciative of the fact that because of the great rise in the number of broadcasters, both in radio and also in television, there is need for a regulator on the whole point of pricing, contents and other issues. Sir, as far as the Government is concerned, earlier, we had come with the Broadcasting Bill in 1997, which could not be taken up because of the dissolution of the other House.

Today, a Convergence Commission Bill is there prepared by hon. Mr. Nariman. The Standing Committee has recommended 77 amendments. The Government has to take a view of those amendments. Under the existing Convergence Commission Bill, there is a common regulator both for content and carriage, airways, telephony and everything. Therefore, the Government has to take a structured view. But, having said that, I want to assure the hon. Member that the need for a regulator is fairly well taken and the Government clearly understands its importance.

SHRIMATI BIMBA RAIKAR: Sir, my second supplementary is, already we are facing many problems with CAS, FM Radio, DTH etc. which were not sorted out despite the intervention of Prime Minister's office. Sir, I would also like to ask, for these small matters, why the Ministry should go to the PM's office, as if the Ministry is not in a position to sort out the problem? Why for such a thing, it should go to PM's office? Even after going to PM's office, what have we got? There was no proper result to us. Sir, now-a-days, private channels like Balaji Telefilms and others are minting money and our Prasar Bharti and Doordarshan are on loss. Sir, Balaji Telefilms has produced 22 serials; Ekta Kapoor is minting money. Why our Doordarshan and Prasar Bharti are on loss? Why should we do all that? Why the Government should not take much more care about it and why you give scope to such private things?

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, many questions have been clubbed together by the hon. Member. But, I would try to answer them as far as possible. Sir, as far as her query about DTH and CAS and the regulator is concerned, let me assure the hon. Member that the need for all this reinforces the requirement of a regulator. Our whole broadcasting horizon is rising enormously. We are coming with DTH and CAS; we are coming with FM channels. And, I am very keen on incurring radio in a very big way. Twenty-nine crore people listen to radio in this country. Therefore, broadcasting is a big service sector. There is a need for a proper regulator to have a determined relationship about the stake-holders, so that the consumer be benefited. Therefore, the need for all this which we have mentioned about reinforces the requirement of a broadcaster. As far as the involvement of the PMO is concerned, I only want to inform the hon. Member that the officer is also an adviser in the I&B Ministry. Therefore, upon my request, he was having a discussion. There was nothing like the PMO as such in that. He is an officer in the PMO, but he is also an adviser in the I&B Ministry. In that capacity, the discussions are going on. As far as why Prasar Bharti is losing and Balaji is earning, the issue is very fundamental. The Prasar Bharti is a public broadcaster. Profit is not the only motive. Service is equally important. As far as Balaji Telefilms is concerned, they are driven by profit motive for their own considerations. Therefore ...(*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI BIMBA RAIKAR: But, they are attracting the public.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Just a minute, Madam.

SHRIMATI BIMBA RAIKAR: Public is mad after them. And, what about your Prasar Bharti? In every house, after 11 o'clock, all the women are not looking after their husbands, they are looking after the serials. From 10.00 p.m. to 11.30 p.m., nobody is speaking on the phone. They have become so popular. Why the Prasar Bharti is not like this? I want that you should have an equal competition and you should show yourselves. The Government should have very good programmes.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: First of all, the Government does not make the programmes, the Prasar Bharti makes the programmes. As far as anyone getting mad after any particular channel is concerned, I want to inform the hon. Member that once CAS comes about, what is

the exact popularity of a particular channel, shall also be known. As of now, there are lot of misgivings and misconceptions, largely also motivated by a deliberate campaign. As far as the need for improving the programmes of the Prasar Bharti is concerned, you have a point. Yes, we have also emphasised upon them. The Prasar Bharti is doing that. I want to inform the hon. Member that recently Gulzar had agreed to make a 26-part serial upon the story of Prem Chand to be telecas on Doordarshan. Other things are also going on. But, remember Doordarshan cannot become Balaji Telefilms. The roles are different. Public broadcaster concept shall always be there.

श्री नाना देशमुख: सभापति महोदय, मंत्री महोदय से मैं एक प्रार्थना करूंगा, जरा आप विचार करिए। बड़े आग्रह के साथ आप इसको कर रहे हैं और इस पर 20 हजार करोड़ रुपया आप लगाने जा रहे हैं। किन्तु अमरीका और यूके इस दृष्टि से बहुत आगे बढ़े हुए लोग हैं, उनके साथ कोलैबोरेशन करके आप इस चीज को बनाने जा रहे हैं, ऑटोनोमस बॉडी बनाने जा रहे हैं। ऐसे समय पर आपको विचार करना होगा कि इसमें से हम लोग अर्थात् भारत कितना लाभ उठायेगा? क्या उसके बिना हम अपना काम नहीं कर सकते? क्या हम लोगों को केवल अमरीका और यूके के साथ संबंध जोड़ करके ही यह काम करने की आवश्यकता है, जिसमें 20 हजार करोड़ रुपया हम अपना लगायेंगे और उनके साथ मिल करके हम यह काम करेंगे? क्या हम इंडीपेंडेंटली यह काम नहीं कर सकते?

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: सर, आदरणीय नाना देशमुख जी बहुत वरिष्ठ हैं और मैं उनका बहुत सम्मान करता हूं। एक बात मैं बहुत विनम्रता से कहना चाहूंगा...(व्यवधान)

श्री सभापति: लालू जी भी यही प्रश्न करना चाहते थे।

श्री लालू प्रसाद: नाना जी ने ठीक कहा, इन लोगों ने तो वायदा किया था कि देशी रास्ते मे मुल्क चलेगा, परन्तु अब सब विदेशी रास्ते पर जा रहे हैं।

श्री सभापति: उनको उत्तर देने दीजिए।

श्री लालू प्रसाद: नाना जी ने ठीक कहा...(व्यवधान)

श्री सभापति: ठीक कहा, इसीलिए मैंने कहा कि आप भी इसी विचार के हैं।

श्री लालू प्रसाद: लेकिन उनकी बातों को सुनता कौन है और ये लोग कह देते हैं कि हम इनका सम्मान करते हैं।

श्री सभापति: ठीक है, ठीक है, अब बोलने दीजिए।

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: सर, मैं पहले एक बात यह कहना चाहूंगा कि रेगुलेटर की स्थापना में बीस हजार करोड़ रुपए के एक्सपेंडीचर की न कोई ऐसी आवश्यकता है और न ही सरकार कोई करने जा रही है। दूसरी बात यह कि हिन्दुस्तान की परिस्थितियों के आलोक में एक रेगुलेटर की आवश्यकता भारत सरकार का स्वयं का संप्रभु निर्णय है। उसमें न हम अमरीका से प्रभावित हैं, न हम किसी अन्य विदेशी देश से प्रभावित हैं। हम यह कहना चाहते हैं बहुत विनम्रता से, कि भारत में ब्राडकास्टिंग का क्षेत्र जिस प्रकार से व्यापक हो रहा है, जिस प्रकार से नए-नए कार्य आ रहे हैं, जिस प्रकार से नई-नई परिस्थितियां पैदा हो रही हैं कंटेंट के संबंध में और उपभोक्ता संबंधी आवश्यकताओं के संबंध में, इसके लिए एक रेगुलटर की नितांत आवश्यकता है। वह रेगुलेटर का स्वरूप क्या होगा, उसके अधिकार क्या होंगे, इस संबंध में हम व्यापक विचार-विमर्श करेंगे, सबसे करेंगे और कन्वर्जन्स बिल के बारे में जो हम अंतिम फैसला करेंगे, वह उसके अनुरूप फैसला होगा।

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, the hon. Minister has talked about the difficulties and the kind of progress that the Government has to make in order to establish a regulator. He has talked about 1997, and then he has talked about the Convergence Commission and so on and so forth. But the fact of the matter is that there are several disputes taking place today in the broadcasting sector between broadcasters and cable operators, and the entire development is adversely affecting the consumers ultimately. Now, I do not know how all these can be done without an independent regulator, and he is not able to assure the House about the time-frame of actually putting the regulator in place. Now, therefore, will he give us an indication as to when an independent regulator in the broadcasting sector starts regulating all these entities?

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, the entire question that he has just put also contains a reply to his query. There is no difference between the hon. Member and the Government, as far as the need for a regulator is concerned. But I want to, at least, share with this hon. House that we came with a Convergence Bill where carriage and content regulator is common. The Standing Committee has proposed 77 amendments; those amendments are to be considered by the concerned IT and Communications....

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: In 1997, you yourself maintained here that... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, I should be allowed to reply. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, he is evading...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him reply....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Therefore, he should make it clear that in 1997 the broadcasting regulator was to put in place...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, I may be allowed to reply...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Basu, let him reply.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, without regulation how it could go on?

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, hon. Nilotpal Basu is a very senior Member of this House. I stated that 'yes', in the year 1997 one Bill was introduced, but it could not be taken up because the House was dissolved. It is a fact that I have stated. Having said that, we, in the Government do appreciate and understand the overpowering need for a regulator. But as far as its modalities are concerned, I have also flagged the issue to you that, as of now, the Convergence Bill contains a provision for content and carriage regulator, which is common. Amendments have come; consultations and discussions are going on. I cannot give a specific time-frame but let me convey to the hon. Member that the Government is quite serious about the need for a regulator and we shall take adequate and expeditious follow-up steps. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: The Government will do everything else but establish the regulator.

श्री प्रेम गुप्ता: सभापति महोदय, मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि स्टैंडिंग कमेटी ने 77 अमेंडमेंट सजेस्ट किए हैं तो क्या इसके लिए फुल टाइम रेगुलेटर की आवश्यकता है? Why cannot this job be done by some regulator? एक तरफ आप बोलते हैं कि सरकार का खर्चा हम कम करना चाहते हैं, फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर हाऊस में स्टेटमेंट देते हैं, अपनी बजट स्पीच में बोलते हैं और. प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने भी कहा है कि सरकार खर्चे कम करे और आप यह रिटायर्ड ब्यूरोक्रेट्स को और आरएसएस के लोगों को आपार्चुनिटी देने के लिए एक नया रेगुलेटर बनाना चाहते हैं क्या?. .(**व्यवधान**) What is the necessity? What is the full time work for this regulator which you are anticipating? (*Interruptions*)

श्री सभापति: आप बैठ जाइए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...उनको बोलने दीजिए, प्लीज। ...(**व्यवधान**)... मिनिस्टर जवाब दे देंगे। आप बैठिए।

श्री प्रेम गुप्ता: मान्यवर, अपने जवाब में उन्होंने खुद कहा है कि यह जो—

"Examination of the working of similar institutions/authorities in selected countries..." Why do you want to follow the American or European or Japanese system for creating a regulator? It is not required. You do not have to go in for a new regulator. It can be very well done by the TRAI. Why are you assigning it to others?

श्री सभापति: बस, खत्म करिए।

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: आदरणीय सभापति महोदय, उठाए गए पूरक प्रश्नों के आलोक में एक बात स्पष्ट है कि डी॰डी॰ए॰ में रेग्यूलेटर हो या न हो इसके बारे में ही सदन बंटा हुआ है। कई लोगों ने कहा है कि जल्दी लाइए और यह कह रहे हैं कि क्या आवश्यकता है। सर, सरकार का इसमें ...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री सभापति: ज्यादा लोगों ने यह कहा है कि जल्दी लाइए।

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: आदरणीय सभापति महोदय, सरकार का बहुत ही सुविचारित मत है कि जिस प्रकार से ब्रोडकास्टिंग का क्षेत्र व्यापक हो रहा है एक रेग्यूलेटर की आवश्यकता है। लेकिन मैंने आरम्भ में बताया तथा मैं उसको रिपीट करना चाहता हूं कि कंवर्जन कमीशन के बिल में एक कॉमन रेग्यूलेटर का प्रावधान है। उसके बारे में एक सुविचारित निर्णय करना है जिसके लिए बहस की परम्परा चल रही है। हमने अमेरिका और इंग्लैंड का कोई फोलोअप करने का निर्णय नहीं किया है। लेकिन जब हम कोई अच्छी चीज लाना चाहते हैं तो विश्व में वह कैसे चल रहा है, भारत की परिस्थितियों के आलोक में हम उनका अनुसरण किस प्रकार से कर सकते हैं और भारत के अपने उदाहरण को और अच्छा कैसे कर सकते हैं इसके लिए अगर कोई हम कम्पेरेटिव स्टडी करते हैं तो अपने आप में गलत बात तो नहीं होगी।

दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण में सुधार

*105. **श्री लाजपत राय:**††
श्री राजीव रंजन सिंह 'ललन':

क्या **शहरी विकास और गरीबी उपशमन** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) क्या यह सच है कि दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण (डी॰डी॰ए॰) ने अपनी नीति, कार्यकरण और ढांचे में व्यापक सुधार के लिए सुझाव देने का कार्य एक व्यावसायिक संस्था को सौंपा है; और

---

†† सभा में यह प्रश्न श्री लाजपत राय द्वारा पूछा गया।